

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 5:24-cv-02050-DDP-SSC Date: February 14, 2025

Title Katherine Mozo Villa v. Warden Eliseo Ricolcol

Present: The Honorable Stephanie S. Christensen, U.S. Magistrate Judge

Teagan Snyder
Deputy Clerk

n/a
Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:
None Present

Attorneys Present for Defendants:
None Present

**Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) Order to Show Cause Why
Petition Should Not Be Dismissed for Failure to
Prosecute and/or Comply with Court Order and
Local Rules**

On September 23, 2024, *pro se* Petitioner Katherine Mozo Villa filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus by a person in federal custody pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. (ECF 1.) On November 5, 2024, the Court ordered Respondent to file either an answer to the petition or a motion to dismiss by December 20, 2024. (ECF 5 at 2.) The Court ordered that, if Respondent filed a motion to dismiss, Petitioner was required to file an opposition or non-opposition to the motion by January 21, 2025. (*Id.* at 3.) On December 18, 2024, Respondent filed a motion to dismiss the petition. (ECF 7.) Petitioner did not file an opposition or non-opposition.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 5:24-cv-02050-DDP-SSC Date: February 14, 2025

Title Katherine Mozo Villa v. Warden Eliseo Ricolcol

Importantly, the Bureau of Prison’s online inmate locator shows that Petitioner was released from custody on January 24, 2025. *See* Inmate Locator, www.bop.gov/inmateloc/ (input registration number 58778-509) (last visited Feb. 13, 2025). Petitioner has not updated her address of record with the Court. Pursuant to Rule 41-6 of the Local Civil Rules for the Central District of California, it is Petitioner’s obligation to keep the Court informed of her current address.

The deadline for Petitioner to file an opposition or non-opposition to the motion to dismiss has passed and it appears Petitioner has been released from custody, yet the court has not received an opposition or non-opposition to Respondent’s motion to dismiss, a notice of change or address, or any other communication from Petitioner. Accordingly, Petitioner is **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE**, in writing, by **March 17, 2025**, why this action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and/or comply with a court order and the Local Rules.

In the event Petitioner wishes to voluntarily dismiss this action, Petitioner may complete and return the enclosed Notice of Dismissal form, CV-09, by **March 17, 2025**.

If Petitioner files an opposition or non-opposition to Respondent’s motion to dismiss by **March 17, 2025**, this order to show cause will be automatically discharged, and Petitioner need not respond to it separately.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 5:24-cv-02050-DDP-SSC Date: February 14, 2025

Title Katherine Mozo Villa v. Warden Eliseo Ricolcol

Petitioner is cautioned that failure to file a timely response to this order to show cause, a notice of voluntary dismissal, or an opposition or non-opposition to Respondent's motion to dismiss the petition will result in a recommendation to the district judge to dismiss this case for failure to prosecute and/or comply with a court order and the Local Rules.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer

:

ts